

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

KHAMILAH S. JOHNSON
Claimant

WALMART ASSOCIATES
Employer

APPEAL 22A-UI-06495-CS-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 05/30/21
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code §96.5(2)a-Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Code §96.5(1)- Voluntary Quit
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On March 11, 2022, the employer/appellant filed an appeal from the March 4, 2022, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on claimant being dismissed on August 27, 2021. A telephone hearing was scheduled to be held on April 22, 2022. The parties appeared at the hearing. At the beginning of the hearing the claimant became disconnected from the hearing. The administrative law judge attempted to call claimant to reconnect her to the hearing. The administrative law judge left a message for claimant informing her to call in to the hearing within fifteen minutes or the hearing would be rescheduled. Claimant did not back in to the hearing and the hearing was postponed. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A hearing was held May 19, 2022. Claimant did not call in to participate. Employer participated through hearing representative Tom Kuiper. Store manager, Liz Graeser, was called as a witness.

ISSUES:

- I. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?
- II. Should claimant repay benefits?
- III. Should the employer be charged due to employer participation in fact finding?
- IV. Is the claimant overpaid benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on June 23, 2017. Claimant last worked as a full-time home line associate.

Claimant was scheduled to work August 5, 2021, August 6, 2021, and August 7, 2021. Claimant did not show up for work or call in to work to inform the employer of her absence. On August 7, 2021, the employer sent claimant a letter. Claimant never responded to the letter and did not return to work.

The employer has a no call, no show written policy. Under the policy if an employee does not show up for their shift or call to inform the employer of their absence three days in a row then they would be considered to have voluntarily quit their employment. Claimant was informed of the policy during the employer orientation.

Claimant received a warning on May 16, 2021, about her absenteeism. Claimant was informed that if she missed anymore work she would be separated from the employer pursuant to their three day no call, no show policy.

Claimant filed a claim for benefits with an effective date of May 30, 2021. Claimant did not start filing for weekly benefits until the week ending February 26, 2022. Claimant has filed for benefits through May 14, 2022. Claimant's weekly benefit amount is \$254.00 per week. Claimant has received \$1,749.00 in state unemployment benefits from week ending February 26, 2022, through week ending May 15, 2022.

The employer participated in a fact-finding interview with Iowa Workforce Development. The employer did not provide any documentation prior to or during the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes as follows:
Iowa Code §96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W. 2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). Where a claimant walked off the job without permission before the end of his shift saying he wanted a meeting with management the next day, the Iowa Court of Appeals ruled this was not a voluntary quit because the claimant's expressed desire to meet with management was evidence that he wished to maintain the employment relationship. Such cases must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(4) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5. However,

the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

- (4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

In this case, claimant had an intention to quit and carried out that intention by failing to come to work for any further scheduled shifts. Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). "Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Indus. Relations Comm'n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). There was no reason given by the claimant for her voluntarily quitting her employment. As such, claimant's leaving the employment was not for a good-cause reason attributable to the employer according to Iowa law. Benefits must be denied.

Because benefits are denied, the issue of overpayment of benefits and chargeability of the benefits must be analyzed.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This

subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in [871—subrule 24.32\(7\)](#). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)“b” as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant’s separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for those benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant’s employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7).

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. From weekending February 26, 2022, through May 14, 2022, claimant has received \$1,749.00 in state unemployment benefits. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received in connection with this employer’s account, and this employer’s account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The March 4, 2022 (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision is REVERSED. Claimant voluntarily quit her employment when she did not show up for work or call in three days in a row which is in violation of the employer's policy. Unemployment insurance benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and earned wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits of \$1,749.00 between week ending February 26, 2022, and May 14, 2022 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.



Carly Smith
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

June 29, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

cs/kmj

NOTE TO CLAIMANT:

- This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits under state law. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.